

THE BUILDER OF THE ORIGINAL  
CHURCH OF THE APOSTLES AT  
CONSTANTINOPLE

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE CRITICISM OF THE  
*VITA CONSTANTINI* ATTRIBUTED TO EUSEBIUS

GLANVILLE DOWNEY

CONCERNING the construction of the original Church of the Apostles at Constantinople there are two traditions, one that the church was built by Constantine the Great (306–337), the other that it was built by his son Constantius (337–361). Scholars have concluded that the latter tradition means that the work was begun by Constantine, but remained unfinished at his death and was completed by his son. The church has thus occupied a prominent place in the building program traditionally attributed to Constantine, ranking with the churches at Jerusalem and Antioch among the major religious and architectural undertakings of the First Christian Emperor.

Supposedly, our oldest witness is Eusebius of Caesarea. In the work attributed to him called the *Vita Constantini*,<sup>1</sup> which is really not a biography of the emperor but a treatise on his religious activities,<sup>2</sup> it is said that Constantine built a church at Constantinople in memory of the apostles, as a burial place for himself; and the *Vita* tells us that after his death Constantine was buried there.

This tradition is followed by Paulinus of Nola,<sup>3</sup> by the church historians Socrates and Sozomen,<sup>4</sup> and by a number of Byzantine historians and chroniclers.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> IV, 58–60, pp. 141–142; IV, 70–71, pp. 146–147, ed. I. A. Heikel (Berlin, 1902).

<sup>2</sup> The Greek title, *Eἰς τὸν βίον τοῦ μακαρίου Κωνσταντίνου βασιλέως* (cf. Heikel's introduction, p. xlvi, and Christ-Schmid-Stählin, *Gesch. der griech. Lit.*, ed. 6, II, 2 [Munich, 1924], p. 1369), is best represented by *De vita Constantini*. However, the traditional Latin title is retained here because it has become familiar and continues to be generally used.

<sup>3</sup> *Carmina*, XIX, 329–342, in *C.S.E.L.*, XXX, p. 130.

<sup>4</sup> Socrates, *Hist. eccl.* I, 16, in *P.G.* LXVII, 117 A; I, 40, in *P.G.* LXVII, 180 B. Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.* II, 34, in *P.G.* LXVII, 1032 C.

<sup>5</sup> Alexander Monachus, *De inventione S. Crucis*, in *P.G.* LXXXVII, pt. 3, 4068 C. Theophanes, A.M. 5816, v. I, p. 23, 30 ff., ed. De Boor (the construction of the Holy Apostles is here recorded under the year A.D. 323/4). Georgius Monachus, p. 501, 2–4, ed. De Boor. The *Chronicle* attributed to Leo Grammaticus (or Symeon Magister), pp. 87, 19–21, and 89, 2–7 Bonn edition; this information also appears in *Theodosii Melitene qui fertur Chronographia*, ed. T. L. F. Tafel (Munich, 1859), pp. 63–64 (on the composition of the chronicle which goes under the names of Symeon, Leo, and Theodosius, see K. Krumbacher, *Gesch. d. byz. Lit.*, ed. 2 [Munich, 1897], pp. 200–203, 361–365; J. B. Bury, *A Hist. of the Eastern Roman Empire* [London, 1912], pp. 455–459; G. Moravcsik, *Die byz. Quellen der Gesch. der Türkvölker* [Budapest, 1942], pp. 321–322). The *Patria*, I, 48, in *Scr. orig. Const.*, ed. Preger, p. 139, 15–17 (“Codinus”); I, 50, p. 140, 9–13; III, 1, p. 214, 5–7; IV, 32, p. 286, 16 ff. The *Synopsis Chronike*, in K. N. Sathas, *Bibl. graeca mediū aevi*, VII, p. 48, 4–9. Michael Glycas (copying the *Patria*), *Annales*, IV, p. 498, 21 ff., Bonn ed. Ignatius of Selymbria, *Vita Constantini et Helena*, in Theophilus Ioannou, *Μνημεῖα Ἀγιολογικά* (Venice, 1884), pp. 224–225 (on this biography, see M. Krašeninnikov, “Prodromus sylloges vitarum laudationumque SS. Constantini M. et Helena matris eius graece atque slavice mox edendarum,” *Revue byzantine*

On the contrary, the construction of the original church is ascribed to Constantius by Philostorgius,<sup>6</sup> by Procopius in the *De aedificiis*,<sup>7</sup> by Con-

[Viz. *obozrienie*], I [1915], pp. 22, 45–46, 48–51; it is possible that Ignatius merely edited or rewrote an earlier work; the style and contents of his *Vita* are such that one could easily believe that it is to be dated as early as the seventh century). The *Synaxarium eccl. Const.* for 21 May (*Propyl. ad Acta SS. Novembris; Acta SS., LXIII*), ed. H. Delehaye, p. 697, 34 ff. (on this notice, see Krašeninnikov, *op. cit.*, Suppl., pp. 72–74). Theodore Lector speaks of the church in a passage from the *Historia tripartita* preserved in the Marcianus MS. (T), published by J. Bidez, *La tradition manuscrite de Sozomène et la Tripartite de Théodore le Lecteur (Texte u. Untersuch.*, XXXII, 2 b, 1908), p. 61. The Church of the Apostles is mentioned also in another passage which has been attributed to Theodore. There exists an epitome of Theodore's historical works which was compiled at the latest at the beginning of the eighth century (Opitz, *R.E.*, V A, 1875 ff.). This epitome used Josephus, Eusebius, and Theodore, and then continued Theodore's work up to the reign of Phocas (602–610). The epitome itself is not preserved, but extracts exist in various MSS. The establishment of the text has not yet been attempted, and it is difficult to know how far the passages published in *P.G. LXXXVI* represent Theodore's own statements. Here (cols. 212–213) the statement is made that Constantius brought to Constantinople the relics of Timothy, Andrew, and Luke, and placed them in the Church of the Apostles which he himself inaugurated (ἐγκαίνισθέντι). This appears to contradict the information preserved in the Marcianus MS. Since the sources and tradition of the epitome have not been established, it would seem hazardous to attribute to Theodore himself the statement that Constantius inaugurated the church, unless we are to suppose that Theodore worked in such uncritical fashion that he reproduced the contradictory statements from different sources without noticing or caring for the disagreement. The attribution of the inauguration of the church to Constantius may represent a statement from another source which was introduced by an editor into Theodore's work. In any case it seems impossible to use these two passages as evidence that, in Theodore's opinion, the Church of the Apostles was begun by Constantine and completed by Constantius.

<sup>6</sup> *Hist. eccl.*, III, 2, pp. 32–33, ed. Bidez; cf. the version in the *Artemii Passio*, 17 (*ibid.*).

<sup>7</sup> I, 4, 19, p. 25, 7, ed. Haury. Some scholars have been misled by faulty texts of Procopius. In the texts of the *De aed.* which were in use in Du Cange's time, it was stated, in the passage on the building of Justinian's Church of the Apostles, that the original church had been built by Constantine. These texts were based on inferior MSS., and their editors were so much under the influence of the Eusebian tradition that they did not perceive that the sense of the sentence in question makes it plain that Procopius meant that the church had been built by Constantius, not Constantine. These early texts stated that Constantine built the church and that he buried the body of his father Constantine there: Κωνσταντῖνος μὲν βασιλεὺς τοῦτον δὴ τὸν νεὼν . . . ἐδείματο . . . οὐδὲν δὴ καὶ Κωνσταντίνου τὸν πατρὸς τὸν νεκρὸν ἔθετο. This of course is impossible, since Constantine the Great's father was Constantius Chlorus. Nevertheless the sense of the Greek is reproduced in Maltretus' Latin version of 1633: *Illic et Constantini patris cadaver condiderat* [sc. Constantinus]. In order to understand the statement about the burial of "his father Constantine," it is necessary to suppose that the subject of the sentence is Κωνστάντιος, not Κωνσταντῖνος. Du Cange alone perceived the significance of the passage. He did not have an opportunity to verify the readings in the MSS. (the principal MS., Haury's V, is in the Vatican), but he pointed out (*Const. Christ.* [Paris, 1680], Book IV, p. 106) that it was necessary to emend the then current text so as to make Procopius' statement read that the church was built by Constantius, rather than Constantine. This self-evident correction was overlooked in the Venice reprint of Maltretus' edition (1729); and when W. Dindorf edited the *De aed.* for the Bonn series (1838) he reprinted Maltretus' text and translation (p. 189). The faulty Greek text thus continued to circulate, and a translation of it was printed by J. P. Richter in his collection of texts on the church (*Quellen der byz. Kunstgesch.* [Vienna, 1897], p. 105). The traditional Latin version of Maltretus, reprinted in the Bonn edition, had made clear the contradiction implied by the Greek text as it stood. Richter's translation, however,

stantine of Rhodes in his description of the Wonders of Constantinople and of the Church of the Apostles (see Figure 13),<sup>8</sup> by Nikolaos Mesarites<sup>9</sup> in

misinterpreted the Greek in such a way that a person who did not consult the original would not perceive that there was something wrong in the Greek; according to Richter's version, Constantine the Great built the church, and buried the body of his father there. The last phrase of the sentence quoted above is mistakenly rendered "Und dorthin setzte er [sc. Konstantin] auch die Leiche des Vaters des Konstantin bei." To give the sense of Richter's translation, the original would have to contain *τοῦ* before *Κωνσταντίνου*, and even in this case the word order would be very unusual. *τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ Κωνσταντίνου* would be indicated for the sense which Richter gives; and even so the Greek would be awkward. The subject of the sentence (in Richter's understanding of it) already being *Κωνσταντίνος*, we should not expect any writer of correct Greek to repeat the name in an oblique case. Had Procopius meant what Richter thought he did, he would almost certainly have written *οὐ δὴ καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πατρὸς τὸν νεκρὸν ἔθετο*. Richter evidently did not know Du Cange's observation on the difficulty. Th. Reinach, when he wrote his commentary on Constantine of Rhodes, independently perceived the difficulty noted by Du Cange, but did not have an opportunity to consult the MSS., and merely pointed out the necessary correction (*Revue des études grecques*, IX [1896], p. 92, n. 3). A. Heisenberg (*Grabeskirche u. Apostelkirche* [Leipzig, 1908], II, p. 110, n. 7) was reminded of the difficulty by Du Cange, and requested J. Haury, who was then preparing his Teubner text of Procopius, to verify the MS. readings. Haury reported that in V, the best

MS., the subject of the sentence, previously printed as *Κωνσταντίνος*, actually was *Κωνσταντῖνος*, i.e., *Κωνστάντιος*; and the correction was made in Haury's Teubner edition of the *De aed.* (1913). It has thus been only in comparatively recent years that scholars in general have understood that the text of Procopius actually states that the original church was built by Constantius; and this gain has been on occasion offset by the continued use, by some students, of Richter's collection and of the Bonn text of the *De aed.*

<sup>8</sup> Line 477, which appears on f. 143<sup>v</sup> of the unique MS. of Constantine (Λ 170, Laura of St. Athanasius, Mt. Athos; No. 1661, 11, *Cat. of the Gr. MSS. in the Library of the Laura on Mt. Athos*, by Spyridon, monk and physician, and Sophronios Eustratiades [Cambridge, Mass., 1925]). On this folio, which is reproduced here in Fig. 13, l. 477 is the thirteenth from the top in the left-hand column (the successive lines are not arranged in columns, but follow each other across the page). In the two editions of Constantine's poem which have been published, by E. Legrand in the *Revue des études grecques*, IX (1896), pp. 32-65 (with commentary by Th. Reinach, pp. 66-103), and by G. P. Begleri, Greek text, with introduction and notes in Russian (Odessa, 1896), the name of the founder of the church is given as *Κωνσταντίνον*. Actually, a photograph of the MS. made on Mt. Athos in 1946 (from which Fig. 13 is reproduced) shows the reading of the MS. to be *Κωνσταντίνον*, spelled out in full so that there is no possibility of misunderstanding. Begleri appears to have edited his text from a longhand copy, in which the name might have been incorrectly transcribed by a copyist who was so familiar with the Eusebian tradition that he wrote the name automatically. Legrand, though he had a photograph of the MS. (see his introduction to his edition, p. 33), fell into the same error. The mistake in transcription went unsuspected because the names of Constantine and Constantius, in the genitive, are metrically equivalent. I have prepared a new text of Constantine's poem (edited from a photograph), with translation and commentary, which will be published as a part of the study of the Church of the Apostles which is being prepared by Professors A. M. Friend, Jr., F. Dvornik, Paul A. Underwood, and myself.

<sup>9</sup> Ch. I and XXXIX, pp. 10-11, 81-82, ed. A. Heisenberg, *Grabeskirche u. Apostelkirche* (Leipzig, 1908), II. Constantine, Mesarites expressly says, was buried originally in the Church of St. Acacius, a shrine (close to the site of the Holy Apostles) which had been built by Constantine himself in honor of one of the principal martyrs of Byzantium. Later (Mesarites states), Constantius built a mausoleum for the reception of his father's body, and moved the body there; and still later Constantius built the Church of the Apostles near the mausoleum.

his description of the church, by Symeon Metaphrastes, and by a passage in the *Synaxarium*.<sup>10</sup>

There is similar disagreement in the accounts of the construction of the Mausoleum of Constantine which was associated with the Church of the Apostles. The *Vita Constantini* attributed to Eusebius describes the disposition of Constantine's sarcophagus, surrounded by twelve *θῆκαι* for the apostles, in such a way that it appears that the writer intended to describe the mausoleum, though a mausoleum as such is not specifically named.<sup>11</sup> Sozomen and the *Patria*<sup>12</sup> state, more precisely, that Constantine built his own mausoleum. On the other hand, the construction of the mausoleum is ascribed to Constantius by Philostorgius and Mesarites.<sup>13</sup> According to Mesarites, Constantine was buried first in the Church of St. Acacius,<sup>14</sup> one of

I have prepared a new text of Mesarites' *ekphrasis* (edited from a photograph), with translation and commentary, which will be published as a part of the study mentioned in the preceding note.

<sup>10</sup> Symeon Metaphrastes, *Martyrium S. Artemii*, 8, in P.G. CXV, 1169; *Vita S. Timothei*, III, 11–12, in P.G. CXIV, 772 B-C. *Synaxarium eccl. Const.* for 22 Jan., p. 412, 16–33, ed. Delehaye.

<sup>11</sup> IV, 60, pp. 141–142, ed. Heikel. The writer of the passage was evidently anxious to make it clear that it was intended that services be held at Constantine's tomb. J. Lassus (*Sanctuaires chrétiens de Syrie* [Paris, 1947], p. 109) suggests that the phraseology of the passage (*καὶ ἐκκλησιάζειν*) shows that the writer considered this an unusual arrangement. It should be noted, however, that *ἐκκλησιάζειν* is not at all an unusual word (see the examples cited in the lexica of Du Cange and Sophocles), so that its use here need not be as significant as M. Lassus believes.

<sup>12</sup> Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.*, II, 34, in P.G., LXVII, 1032 C. *Patria*, p. 140, 9–13, ed. Preger.

<sup>13</sup> Philostorg., *loc. cit.* (above, n. 6). Mes., *locc. citt.* (above, n. 9). This tradition also appears in Zonaras, XIII, 4, 28, v. III, p. 24, 14 ff., Bonn ed.

<sup>14</sup> Constantine seems to have built two churches at Constantinople dedicated to St. Acacius: cf. Du Cange, *Const. Christ.*, Book IV, p. 118 (to the texts cited there, add Mesarites, I, pp. 10–11, ed. Heisenberg, and note that the passages in the *Patria* cited by Du Cange are to be found at pp. 74, 8; 140, 10; 214, 4; 219, 6; 253, 5 and 19, in Preger's edition), and in addition, S. Salaville, "Les églises Saint-Acace à Constantinople," *Echos d'Orient*, XII (1909), pp. 103–108; A. Van Millingen, *Byz. Constantinople: The Walls of the City* (London, 1899), pp. 213, 303; A. Grabar, *Martyrium* (Paris, 1943–46), I, p. 71, n. 8; H. Delehaye in *Anal. Boll.*, XXXI (1912), pp. 228 ff.; *id.*, "Deux Typica Byzantins de l'époque des Paléologues," *Acad. r. de Belgique, Cl. des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques, Mémoires*, sér. 2, tome XIII (1921), pp. 153–154. St. Acacius was evidently chosen for commemoration because he was a Cappadocian soldier who was martyred at Byzantium under Diocletian in 303; cf. S. Salaville, "Acace," No. 2, Baudrillart, *Dict. d'hist. et de géogr. eccl.*, I, 237–240. We have no evidence for the precise location of the Church of St. Acacius, which, according to Mesarites (*loc. cit.*) stood near the Church of the Apostles. However, we know from the *Notitia urbis Const.* (p. 237, ed. O. Seeck) that it was in Regio X (the Holy Apostles was in Regio XI), and a passage in the *Patria* (p. 253, 19 ff., app. crit., ed. Preger) may show that this church was "at the Imperial Gate," *ἐν τῇ βασιλικῇ πόρτᾳ*. This gate has not been identified, but it seems likely that it was in the Wall of Constantine; on the course of this wall near the Holy Apostles, see van Millingen, *op. cit.*, pp. 15–33; Th. Preger, "Studien zur Topographie Konstantinopels, III: Die Konstantinsmauer," *Byz. Ztschr.*, XIX (1910), pp. 450–461; F. Krischen,

Constantine's own buildings, and his body was later transferred to the mausoleum, which was built by Constantius.<sup>15</sup>

Finally, three chronicles, without mentioning who had built the church, record that it was dedicated in A.D. 370.<sup>16</sup>

The same divergence appears in the statements concerning the relics of the Apostles Andrew, Luke, and Timothy, which were among the chief treasures of the church. Some of the sources which say that Constantine built the church also state that the emperor placed the relics of the three apostles in it,<sup>17</sup> while some of the sources which ascribe the church to Constantius state that it was he who brought the relics to it.<sup>18</sup> The *Vita Constantini*, we are surprised to learn, does not mention these relics.

Such, briefly, are the two traditions. Let us examine certain details which

*Die Landmauer von Konstantinopel* (Berlin, 1938), p. 4, fig. 1. As to whether the Church of St. Acacius was within or without the wall, we have no evidence. Its possible location near the gate, however, is of interest in connection with the question whether the church, as the original burial place of Constantine, would have been *intra muros* or *extra muros*; on the location of early *martyria* in this respect, see Grabar, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 210–213. On the incident of the transfer of Constantine's body by the bishop Macedonius, which M. Grabar discusses on p. 231, see further below, n. 58, and p. 74.

<sup>15</sup> Several sources state or imply that Constantine was buried at the Holy Apostles, by which of course they might mean that the burial actually took place in the mausoleum, which would, in the usage prevailing at least in later times, be considered a part of the church. The *Vita Constantini*, at IV, 71, p. 147, ed. Heikel, implies that Constantine was buried at the Holy Apostles immediately after his death. Socrates (I, 40, in *P.G.*, LXVII, 180 B) describes the funeral and says that Constantine was buried immediately "in the church named for the Apostles." Sozomen (*loc. cit.* [above, n. 12]) says that Constantius after the funeral buried his father "in the church named for the Apostles, where Constantine himself, while still living, prepared his own tomb." Alexander Monachus (*loc. cit.* [above, n. 5]) describes the funeral; he does not say specifically that Constantine was buried at the church, but does say that Constantine had built the church "that the emperors and priests might be buried there" (this does not mean both priests and emperors, but is an allusion to the priestly character of the imperial office; see L. Bréhier, "Ιερεὺς καὶ βασιλεὺς," *Mémorial L. Petit* [Bucharest, 1948], pp. 41–45). The *Chronicon Paschale* (p. 538, 15–17, Bonn ed.) records that Constantine was buried "in the Church of the Holy Apostles, in which lie the remains of the holy apostles Andrew . . . Luke . . . and Timothy," but does not say that the burial took place immediately after the funeral. Theophanes (A.M. 5828, p. 33, 32–33, ed. De Boor) records that Constantius buried his father "in the Apostles." Zonaras (*loc. cit.* [above, n. 13]) writes that Constantius gave his father a "magnificent funeral, and buried him in the Church of the Holy Apostles, in a separate *stoa*, however, which he himself built as a tomb for his father" (*stoa* here might mean the mausoleum; the term was used of any building which consisted primarily of, or even contained, a colonnade; see Heisenberg, *op. cit.*, II, p. 107, and G. Downey, "The Architectural Significance of the Use of the Words *stoa* and *basilike* in Classical Literature," *American Journal of Archaeology*, XLI [1937], pp. 194–211).

<sup>16</sup> *Chronica Constantinopolitana*, an. 370, p. 242, ed. Mommsen, *Chron. Min.* I. St. Jerome, *Chron.*, an. 370, p. 245, ed. Helm. *Chron. Pasch.*, p. 559, 13–15, Bonn ed.

<sup>17</sup> Paulinus of Nola, cited above, n. 3. Leo Gram., p. 87, 19–21, Bonn ed.

<sup>18</sup> St. Jerome, *Chron.*, ann. 356, 357, pp. 240–241, ed. Helm. *Chron. Pasch.*, p. 542, 7–11 and 14–18, Bonn ed. Philostorg., cited above, n. 6. Theod. Lect., *P.G.*, LXXXVI, 212–213. *Chron. Const.*, pp. 238–239, ed. Mommsen, *Chron. Min.* I.

appear in them. We may begin with the *Vita Constantini*, in which two passages are devoted to the building. The first (IV, 58–60) describes the church and gives an account of Constantine's purpose in building it, and of his death. The second (IV, 70–71) describes Constantine's funeral and the placing of his body in the church. After describing the funeral, the *Vita* goes on to say (IV, 71, p. 147, ed. Heikel): "And in this respect also God showed favor to the man who worshipped him, in that after his death, He gave the empire to his own beloved sons, his successors, and He deemed him worthy of the burial-place which he had earnestly desired, along with the memory of the apostles;<sup>19</sup> so that it is possible to see even now the earthly tabernacle of his thrice-blessed soul (*ώς ὁράν *έστι**)<sup>20</sup> *εἰσέτι καὶ νῦν τὸ μὲν τῆς τρισμακαρίας ψυχῆς σκῆνος*), glorified likewise with the title of the apostles,<sup>21</sup> and frequented by the people of God, honored both by divine ordinances and by mystic services, and enjoying participation in holy prayers."

The statement that "it is possible to see even now" the tomb of Constantine is very curious indeed. Eusebius died before 340, and there is reason to believe that his death occurred in May 338, just a year after Constantine's.<sup>22</sup> It is impossible to believe that Eusebius himself, if he wrote this passage a short time after Constantine's death, can have had any reason to mention that the emperor's tomb was to be seen "even now" at the Holy Apostles. On the contrary, such a remark is a familiar and widely employed stock motif of popular chronicles and edifying works, in which it is used, often rather naïvely, in order to lend verisimilitude to tales designed for simple audiences.<sup>23</sup> The presence of the phrase here indicates that this pas-

<sup>19</sup> I.e., God deemed Constantine worthy of (1) lying in the place he had wished to be buried, and (2) sharing the memory of the Apostles. *μνήμη* could be understood in the sense of tomb ("memorial"), in which case the sense would be that God deemed Constantine worthy of being buried in the memorial of the Apostles.

<sup>20</sup> *έστι* added by Heikel.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Romans viii, 16–17 (Revised Standard Version): ". . . it is the Spirit himself bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God, and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and fellow heirs of Christ, provided we suffer with him in order that we may also be glorified with him (*εἰπερ συμπάσομεν, ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν*)."

<sup>22</sup> Eusebius was seventy-five when Constantine died on 22 May 337; he died himself before 340; E. Schwartz, "Eusebius," *R.E.*, VI, 1434. G. Pasquali, "Die Composition der *Vita Constantini* des Eusebius," *Hermes*, XLV (1910), p. 386, places his death in May 338; this date is accepted by J. Maurice, *Bull. de la Soc. nat. des antiq. de France*, 1913, p. 387, n. 2.

<sup>23</sup> See, for example, Joshua vii, 26; ix, 27; I Kings viii, 8; II Chron. v, 9; Dio Cass., LXII, 17, 2; *Scr. hist. Aug., Pert.*, II, 3; *Ant. Pius*, VIII, 2; Theodoret, *Hist. relig.*, II, in P.G. LXXXII, 1313 A; Marc. Comes, *Chron.*, an. 390 (Mommsen, *Chron. min.*, II, p. 62, 24–25); an. 403 (*ibid.*, p. 67, 19–21); Ephraemius, *Chron.*, v. 5598, p. 230, Bonn ed. The sixth-century chronicler John Malalas, who wrote for popular consumption, frequently states that inscriptions and other monuments "are still to be seen" when it is certain that he cannot have seen them himself; he must have borrowed the phrase from his sources, or have added it of his

sage, in the form in which we have it, cannot be wholly the work of Eusebius, but must have been revised some time after his death by a writer who sought to make his testimony as impressive as possible, and for this purpose employed a simple literary device which was familiar to his readers and himself.<sup>24</sup>

Another curious point is that there is a basic disagreement, between the *Vita Constantini* and the other sources which attribute the church to Constantine, as to the emperor's purpose in building it. According to the *Vita* (IV, 60, p. 141, 25 ff., ed. Heikel), Constantine built the church for the perpetuation of the memory of the apostles and for the reception of his own body, foreseeing that after his death his body "would come to share the title of the Apostles." This, in fact, is what happened, according to the later passage (IV, 71). It seems quite surprising to find that although this tradition of Constantine as the Thirteenth Apostle came later to have a considerable vogue,<sup>25</sup> Socrates, Sozomen, and the other writers who state that Constan-

own initiative: G. Downey, "References to Inscriptions in the Chronicle of Malalas," *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, LXVI (1935), pp. 55-72.

<sup>24</sup> The words *ώς ὁπάν {έστι} εἰσέτι καὶ νῦν* are omitted in some MSS. of the *Vita*. On the MSS., see the Introduction to Heikel's edition, pp. ix-xxviii, and the further discussion in his *Kritische Beiträge zu den Constantin-Schriften des Eusebius*, in *Texte u. Untersuch.*, XXXVI, 4 (1911), pp. 49-81.

<sup>25</sup> The tradition of Constantine the *isapostolos* reflects the "subtle glorification of the Church's patron" (C. N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture* [Oxford, 1940], p. 208). It appears in Theodoret (*H.E.*, I, 1, in *P.G.*, LXXXII, 884). Constantine's calling was spoken of in the terminology of Gal. i, 1: "Paul, an apostle (not of men, neither by men, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father)." Mesarites (p. 82, 7, ed. Heisenberg) calls Constantine the "thirteenth herald of the orthodox faith," after the twelve apostles. Thus Constantine was in a sense equated with Paul: A. Baumstark, "Konstantin, der 'Apostelgleiche,' u. das Kirchengesangbuch des Severus von Antiocheia," in *Konstantin d. G. u. seine Zeit*, ed. F. J. Dölger (Freiburg-i.-Br., 1913), pp. 248-254 (*Röm. Quartalschrift*, Suppl. XIX). It is suggestive that Mesarites (pp. 87-88, ed. Heisenberg) appears to mention a statue of Paul outside the Church of the Apostles. Constantine's reputed plan for his own burial would easily give rise to the further step in which the emperor was elevated to be thirteenth Apostle just as Alexander the Great, Hadrian, and Alexander Severus had been elevated to the position of the Thirteenth God (the twelve apostles being the Christian counterparts of the twelve ancient gods): O. Weinreich, "Konstantin der Grosse als Dreizehnter Apostel u. die religionspolitische Tendenz seiner Grabeskirche," *Triskaidekatische Studien* (Giessen, 1916), pp. 3-14 (*Religionsgeschichtl. Versuche u. Vorarbeiten*, XVI, 1); *idem*, "Zwölfgötter," Roscher, *Lex. d. griech. u. röm. Mythologie*, VI, 787-88, 847-48; cf. A. Grabar, *Martyrium* (Paris, 1943-46), I, p. 233, n. 3; O. Treitinger, *Die oström. Kaiser- u. Reichsidee* (Jena, 1938), pp. 129-130; N. H. Baynes, *Constantine the Great and the Christian Church* (London, 1931; *Proc. of the British Academy*, XV), pp. 93-95; A. Kaniuth, *Die Beisetzung Konstantins des Grossen: Untersuchungen zur religiösen Haltung des Kaisers* (*Breslauer Histor. Forschungen*, 18; Breslau, 1941), pp. 35-38, 62-64. Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos, *ca. 1317 A.D. (Hist. eccl.*, VIII, 55, in *P.G.*, CXLVI, 220 B-D), states in fact that "Constantine, while still living, had prepared a tomb for himself [at the Holy Apostles], which was formerly an altar of the pagans, called that of the Twelve Gods." It must be noted that Nicephorus Callistus is known to have embroidered some of the information which he gives concerning the statue of Con-

tine built the church have nothing whatever to say about his having built it because he wished or expected to become *isapostolos*. Socrates and Sozomen, in fact, have a quite different conception of Constantine's purpose. Socrates says that Constantine had built the church in order that "the emperors and priests should not be separated from the relics of the apostles."<sup>26</sup> Sozomen, on the other hand, instead of saying that Constantine had intended that future emperors should be buried at the Holy Apostles, writes that "Constantine, while still living, had prepared his own tomb" at the Holy Apostles, and that "from this [the burial of Constantine] the custom took its beginning, and after this the Christian emperors who died in Constantinople were laid there."<sup>27</sup> This disagreement gives added reason for suspecting that the passages in question in the *Vita Constantini* are not, in their present form, wholly the work of Eusebius. A statement by Eusebius himself as to Constantine's purpose in building the Church of the Apostles would have carried such authority that it would have had to be accepted by later writers.<sup>28</sup>

stantine the Great on the Forum of Constantine, adding a detail concerning a cross on the globe held by the emperor which evidently did not exist as he describes it (or he may have reproduced the information from a source); see A. Frolov, "La dédicace de Constantinople dans la tradition byzantine," *Rev. de l'hist. des religions*, CXXVII (1944), p. 67, n. 1, and Baynes, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-94. Nicephorus followed the tradition according to which Constantine dedicated Constantinople to Christ, which is almost certainly not true, it being much more likely that the city was dedicated with purely pagan rites: Frolov, *op. cit.*, pp. 69, 73, 85, 126. There appears to be an echo of this tradition in Chrysostom's 26th homily on II Corinth. Chrysostom (4, in *P.G.*, LXI, 580ff.) points out the contrast between the present state of the church, at peace, and the period of persecution. Now, he says, people are inclined to be lax, and have filled the church with countless evils; formerly Christians were sober minded. He proceeds to tell how idolatries gained ground when men were admired beyond their deserts. Thus for example human rulers were decreed by the Roman State to be the Thirteenth God. After a discussion on this theme, he closes with a reference to the imperial tombs at Constantinople (§5), pointing out the humble relationship of the emperors to the apostles near whom they were buried; Constantius, he notes, was doing Constantine a great honor in burying him "at the vestibule of the fisherman." There is of course no proof that Chrysostom, in castigating the present state of the church and the idolatries which led to the elevation of Alexander and others as the Thirteenth God, had Constantine the Great in mind; but the comparison could well have occurred to his hearers, and it seems certain in any case that there must have been many who disapproved of the conception of Constantine as *isapostolos* and as the equal of Christ. A reflection of this feeling may appear in Gregory of Nazianzus' invective against Julian (*Or. V, Contra Julianum* II, 17, in *P.G.*, XXXV, 685 C-688 A), in which Gregory remarks that the members of the imperial family buried at the Church of the Apostles have "almost equal honors" with the Apostles.

<sup>26</sup> Socrates, *Hist. eccl.*, I, 40, in *P.G.*, LXVII, 180 B. The phrase "emperors and priests" refers to the emperors in their sacerdotal capacity; see above, n. 15. Our evidence indicates that bishops and patriarchs were buried at the Holy Apostles only for special reasons. The evidence for burials at the church is collected in my commentary on the texts concerning the church in the study mentioned above in nn. 8-9.

<sup>27</sup> *Hist. eccl.*, II, 34, in *P.G.*, LXVII, 1032 C.

<sup>28</sup> For a review and discussion of these questions, see Agathe Kaniuth, *Die Beisetzung Konstantins des Grossen: Untersuchungen zur religiösen Haltung des Kaisers* (Breslauer

There is, in fact, ample reason to believe, from other evidence, that the *Vita Constantini* as we have it cannot have come entirely from the pen of Eusebius. It is highly probable, of course, that Eusebius wrote a treatise on the emperor's religious life and activities, of the same general character as the document which we now possess. There are, however, a number of clear indications, in addition to those which have just been pointed out, that the original treatise must have been revised after Eusebius' death. It was only natural that the circumstances attending the triumph and establishment of the Christian church should produce not only factual accounts of the conversion of the First Christian Emperor and of the labors which he performed in behalf of his Church, but a generous amount of panegyric and praise,

*Histor. Forschungen*, 18; Breslau, 1941). See the reviews of this dissertation by A. M. Schneider, *Gött. gelehrt. Anzeigen* 1942, pp. 117–123, and W. Ensslin, *Klio*, XXXVI (1944), pp. 255–257, also the remarks by Ensslin in *Byzantion*, XVIII (1946–48), p. 269, and by A. Grabar, *Martyrium* (Paris, 1943–46), I, p. 250, n. 1. Another explanation of Constantine's purpose and procedure in building the Church of the Apostles is offered by F. Wieland, *Mensa und Confessio, Studien über den Altar der altchristlichen Liturgie*; Teil II: *Altar und Altargrab der christl. Kirchen im 4. Jh.* (Munich, 1906 – Leipzig, 1912), pp. 86–87 (*Veröffentlichungen aus dem Kirchenhistorischen Seminar München*. 2. Reihe, Nr. 11). Wieland thinks that there was a desire to duplicate the church built at the Holy Sepulcher, and that Constantine built the Church of the Apostles at Constantinople so that the new capital might have a church of apostles similar to that at Rome. Constantine did not place apostles' relics in the church, Wieland thinks, because the custom had not yet arisen of obtaining relics. Certain errors in Wieland's statements may be noted. It is misleading to say (p. 86) that Constantine's church was built "am Marktplatz"; while there may very well have been a square in front of the church, Wieland's phraseology suggests that the church stood on the principal forum of the city, which so far as we know is not true. It is inaccurate to write (p. 87) that Constantine's Mausoleum was erected "in der Vorhalle" of the church; this statement is based upon a misunderstanding of Chrysostom's references (*Hom. contra Iudeos et Gentiles*, 9, in *P.G.*, XLVIII, 825; *Hom. in Epist. II ad Cor.*, XXVI, 5, in *P.G.*, LXI, 582) to the burial of the emperors in the mausoleum. Wieland is mistaken in stating that St. Jerome writes that Arcadius transferred the relics of the Prophet Samuel to the church. Actually, Jerome says only that Arcadius took Samuel's bones in *Thraciam* (*Contra Vigilantium*, 5, in *P.L.*, XXIII, 358 B; this passage is wrongly cited by Wieland as col. 343). Wieland also gives a mistaken reference to the passage in Jerome, *De viris illustribus*, 8, in which, he says, Jerome mentions Constantius' translation of the relics of Andrew, Luke, and Timothy to the Church of the Apostles. The passage is at col. 651, not col. 622, as Wieland writes, and Jerome here states that Constantius buried the relics of Luke and Andrew in Constantinople, without mentioning the Church of the Apostles. Jerome mentions Constantius' burial of Andrew, Luke, and Timothy at Constantinople (again without mentioning the Church of the Apostles) in *Contra Vigilantium*, 51, in *P.L.*, XXIII, 358 B (a passage which Wieland does not note). Wieland does not mention the tradition that it was Constantine, not Constantius, who took the relics of the three apostles to his new Church of the Apostles. Wieland discusses the church in another part of his study (pp. 101–102). There he examines the reasons why in the *Vita Constantini* attributed to Eusebius (IV, 60, pp. 141–142, ed. Heikel) it is stated that Constantine ordered that services be conducted at his grave. This shows, Wieland thinks, that this was an unusual use of an altar, and Constantine's action indicates that the celebration of services on days other than saints' festivals and the permanent location of altars in martyria were both exceptional.

designed for the satisfaction and edification of the faithful and for the confusion of their adversaries. Constantine, no matter how great even his real deeds may have been, was fated to become not only a heroic but a legendary figure. Scholars have perceived a number of inconsistencies and inaccuracies in the *Vita* which can only represent additions and interpolations made after Eusebius' death, sometimes with the purpose of making the *Vita* a vehicle for particular ideas and points of view. It must be pointed out at once that, as N. H. Baynes has observed,<sup>29</sup> the critics of the panegyric have sometimes failed to take account of the professed purpose of the work, which was (I, 11, p. 12, 30–31, ed. Heikel) "to speak and write only of the matters which concern his [Constantine's] eager religious life (*μόνα τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεοφιλῆ συντείνοντα βίον λέγειν τε καὶ γράφειν*)."<sup>30</sup> However, the promise and the performance are quite different.

In 1882 P. Meyer pointed out<sup>31</sup> that while the writer of the introduction to the *Vita* states (in the words quoted in part above) that the purpose of the work is to treat only of Constantine's religious life,<sup>32</sup> the book actually describes Constantine's victory over the barbarians of the Rhine, and his conquest of Britain (I, 25), the war against Maxentius (I, 26–40), Constantine's triumphs over the barbarians (I, 46), and the conquest of the Scythians and the Sarmatians (IV, 5–6). In I, 28, it is stated that no account will be given in the present work of the downfall of the tyrants who made war upon the churches of God; yet considerable space is devoted to the downfall of Galerius and Maximinus (I, 55–59). A few years later A. Crivellucci<sup>33</sup> devoted an elaborate study to the collection and examination of errors and contradictions in the *Vita*, in which he pointed out, among other

<sup>29</sup> *Cambr. Anc. Hist.*, XII, p. 713.

<sup>30</sup> "De vita Constantini Eusebiana," *Festschrift dem Gymnasium Adolfinum zu Moers . . . gediwmet vom Lehrerkollegium des Gymnasiums zu Crefeld* (Bonn, 1882), pp. 23–28.

<sup>31</sup> The passage is as follows (I, 11, p. 12, 23 ff. ed. Heikel): "It is my intention to omit most of the acts of imperial generalship of this thrice-blessed man, such as his engagements and battles, his successes in war and his victories and the trophies he won from his enemies and his triumphs; and also the legislation which was enacted by him in time of peace for the restoration of his subjects as a whole and for the benefit of individuals, and likewise the dispositions which he made for the advantage of the subjects of his state, as well as most of the other efforts of his imperial labors, which are remembered by everyone, the purpose of our present undertaking being to speak and write only of those things which concern his eager religious life. And since even these things are myriad, I shall choose those which have come to my knowledge which are most appropriate and are worthy of being recorded for posterity, and I shall set them forth as briefly as possible." With this profession of purpose may be compared the remark of Socrates, in the prooemium of his *Ecclesiastical History* (P.G., LXVII, 33 A), that Eusebius, in his work on the life of Constantine, was more interested in elaborate praise of the emperor than in accurate statement of fact.

<sup>32</sup> *Della fede storica di Eusebio nella Vita di Constantino (Appendice al vol. primo della Storia delle relazione tra lo Stato e la Chiesa*, Bologna, 1886) (Livorno, 1888).

things, that later church historians felt it necessary to note that the *Vita*'s accounts of certain events were not correct.

A further study along the same lines was published in 1910 by G. Pasquali,<sup>33</sup> who noted that the text of the *Vita* as we have it contains major alterations and additions which must have been made after Eusebius' death. Pursuing the same course of investigation, Jules Maurice<sup>34</sup> concluded that the *Vita* was retouched first by Eusebius himself and then, after the author's death, was again worked over by some one who was favorable to the religious policy of Constantius, which differed from his father's. Not only (Maurice points out) does the *Vita* differ in essential points from Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, but it contradicts itself with regard to the religious policy of Constantine. O. Stählin<sup>35</sup> came to a similar result.

The most detailed study of the question in recent years is that of H. Grégoire,<sup>36</sup> who points out that while the *Vita* may contain a kernel of material by Eusebius, there is much in the book that could not possibly have been written by him. The treatise, Grégoire shows, gives a confused and inaccurate picture of the wars between Licinius and Constantine in 314 and 324. The writer of the description of the wars, in Grégoire's opinion, could have been neither Eusebius himself nor a contemporary of the events described; this writer had before him a nearly accurate account of the two wars, but either he did not understand it, or it misled him.<sup>37</sup> In one sense, indeed, as Grégoire remarks, the *Vita* is a kind of "Christian pendant" of the *Historia Augusta*, being written to glorify Constantine and to describe the pious works which it would be suitable for the first Christian emperor to have performed. In its present form, Grégoire concludes, the *Vita* represents the work of Euzoios, the Arian Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine (ca. 370 – ca. 380), who had come into possession of Eusebius' papers and library; and

<sup>33</sup> "Die Composition der Vita Constantini des Eusebius," *Hermes*, XLV (1910), pp. 369–386.

<sup>34</sup> *Bull. de la Soc. nat. des antiq. de France*, 1913, pp. 387–396; *ibid.*, 1919, pp. 154–155.

<sup>35</sup> In Schmid and Stählin's revision of Christ's *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, 6th ed., II, 2 (Munich, 1924), p. 1369. Stählin believes that the work was left unfinished at Eusebius' death and was subsequently enlarged by the insertion of various kinds of material, notably the documents which are quoted in the present text. These documents Stählin believes to be genuine.

<sup>36</sup> "Eusèbe n'est pas l'auteur de la 'Vita Constantini' dans sa forme actuelle et Constantin ne s'est pas 'converti' en 312," *Byzantion*, XIII (1938), pp. 561–583.

<sup>37</sup> Grégoire writes (*ibid.*, p. 582): "Affirmer que la guerre de 314, suivie de la paix et d'une nouvelle guerre (324), eut pour cause unique la 'persécution' de Licinius contre les chrétiens, persécution qui n'est pas antérieure à 320, c'est aussi 'fort' que d'affirmer, par exemple, que M. Poincaré occupa la Ruhr (en 1923) parce que M. Hitler y persécutait les Juifs. Un livre que contiendrait cette affirmation, et qui serait donné pour une oeuvre de M. André Tardieu, parue en 1940, serait à bon droit rejeté par la critique des âges futurs. . ."

the version which we possess was not published before the latter part of the fourth century. Moreover, Grégoire points out,<sup>38</sup> the *Vita* is the only one of the works attributed to Eusebius which contains a description of the famous vision which Constantine is supposed to have had in 312; and this vision is mentioned by no writer of the fourth century, but appears first in Socrates and Sozomen. This circumstance, Grégoire contends, shows that Eusebius himself knew nothing of the supposed vision; that the legend of the vision originated elsewhere; and that its presence in the *Vita* reveals once more the hand of an interpolator.<sup>39</sup>

A recent study by W. Seston<sup>40</sup> points out that the *Vita* is not consistent with itself on major points of Constantine's religious policy, and that its statement on the philosophical basis of the Christian emperor's mission and power is exactly the opposite of the statement on the same subject made by Eusebius on the occasion of Constantine's thirtieth anniversary as emperor in 335, in an oration whose authenticity has not been questioned.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>38</sup> "La vision de Constantin 'liquideé,'" *Byzantion*, XIV (1939), pp. 341-351; see also Grégoire's earlier remarks on the same subject in *Byzantion*, XIII (1938), pp. 568, 578-579, 583, n. 3.

<sup>39</sup> As a comment on Grégoire's argument, J. Vogt points out ("Berichte über Kreuzerscheinungen aus dem 4. Jr. n. Chr.," *Ann. de l'Inst. de philol. et d'hist. orient. et slaves*, IX [1949], pp. 593-606 [Mél. H. Grégoire]) that Gregory of Nazianzus and Cyril of Jerusalem, writing in the fourth century, must have been acquainted with the vision of Constantine. Vogt's observations, however, do not seem to the present writer to prove that the account of the vision in the *Vita Constantini* is not an interpolation.

<sup>40</sup> "Constantine as a 'Bishop,'" *Journal of Roman Studies*, XXXVII (1947), pp. 127-131 (*Papers Presented to N. H. Baynes*). See also Seston's earlier remarks on the *Vita Constantini* in *Revue des études anciennes*, XL (1938), pp. 106-107, and A. Kaniuth, *Die Beisetzung Konstantins des Grossen* (Diss., Breslau, 1941), pp. 56-58.

<sup>41</sup> The meaning of this, Seston suggests, is to be found in the position taken by Athanasius in 338. In the *Apologia contra Arianos* (3-4, in P.G., XXV, 252-253), written in 346, he blames his enemies (the party of Eusebius) for laying questions of discipline and dogma before the emperor, and points out that it is the party of Eusebius which uses the external power to attack his own followers. In this way Athanasius claims autonomy for the Church "in the face of the emperors whom the Arians ask to intervene in the internal affairs of that Church." The conclusion to be drawn from Seston's study is that in these respects the *Vita Constantini* represents propaganda for the party of Athanasius. Eusebius could hardly have attempted to put in the *Vita Constantini*, which he is supposed to have written shortly after the death of Constantine (337), a statement of the emperor's power and functions which was directly opposed to the philosophy which he had set forth in the oration written for the Tricennalia in 335. The *Vita* indeed in its present form is (as has been noted) inconsistent on the matter of the imperial functions in church matters. Some passages contain statements which are in conformity with Eusebius' own ideas. It seems certain, however, that the passages examined by Seston betray the hand of a follower of Athanasius who interpolated material which would serve as propaganda against Constantius' efforts to set himself up as arbiter in church disputes. There does not seem necessarily to be a conflict between Seston's opinion that the passages which he studies represent the work of an adherent of Athanasius, and Grégoire's suggestion that the *Vita* was put into its present form toward the end of the fourth

It is clear that there are good grounds to believe that the *Vita Constantini* as we have it contains a noticeable amount of material which cannot have been written by Eusebius.<sup>42</sup> The studies mentioned above, which deal with many different sections of the *Vita*, all tend in the same direction, suggesting that an original treatise, written by Eusebius, was later expanded and in places reworked, at different times, by a person or persons who sought to make the document a vehicle for their own views. As Heikel points out in the introduction to his edition of the work (p. XXXVIII, n. 1), a text as important and as interesting as a *Vita Constantini* which bore the name of Eusebius would be the object of constant study and would be a peculiarly fit subject for exegesis and "improvement." The scholars who believe that the document as we have it is wholly the work of Eusebius have sometimes remained unconvinced by the claims of those who have discovered interpolations and alterations in it, but as A. Piganiol, the writer of the latest summary of the debate over the document,<sup>43</sup> rightly points out, the criticisms which find interpolations in the work have not been wholly refuted.

---

century. The *Vita*, as Seston points out, appears certainly to be "a thing of scraps and tatters," and it seems perfectly possible that some of the revisions which it plainly suffered were made by different hands and at different times.

<sup>42</sup> The *Vita* is not mentioned in Jerome's list of Eusebius' works (*De viris ill.*, LXXXI, p. 51, ed. Herding), but this omission, while it may be highly significant, does not constitute a decisive argument, since Jerome's list is not complete in other respects. It is of interest to note that from his study of the dedication of Constantinople, A. Frolow concludes that the account of the *Vita Constantini* (III, 48) of the dedication of the city to "the God of the martyrs" is very likely not true, and that the city was actually dedicated, originally, to Tyche ("La dédicace de Constantinople dans la tradition byzantine," *Rev. de l'hist. des religions*, CXVII [1944], pp. 61-127; see also A. Alföldi, "On the Foundation of Constantinople: a Few Notes," *Journal of Roman Studies*, XXXVII [1947], p. 16; E. Gren, "Zu den Legenden von der Gründung Konstantinopels," *Eranos*, XLV [1947], pp. 153-164, and A. Piganiol, *L'Empire chrétien*, 325-395 [Paris, 1947], p. 49). I have not had an opportunity to consult E. Gren, "Zu den Legenden von der Gründung Konstantinopels," *Commentationes gratulatoriae G. Kazarov oblatae*, I (Sofia, 1950), pp. 151-157.

<sup>43</sup> "L'état actuel de la question constantinienne 1939/49," *Historia*, I (1950), pp. 82-96, with bibliography (the title of the paper contains the dates 1930/49, while the running heads of the pages, and the table of contents of the fascicule give the dates 1939/49, which, from the contents of the paper, seems to be correct). The conservative position is represented by N. H. Baynes in his masterly survey of the early stages of the controversy, *Constantine the Great and the Christian Church* (*Proceedings of the British Academy*, XV; London, 1931), but much work has been done since Baynes wrote. To the recent bibliography cited by Piganiol may be added the following items which either were not accessible to him, or do not fall within the chronological limits of his survey: E. Ivánka, an article on Constantine's conversion to Christianity in the light of new research (in Hungarian), in *Theologia* (Budapest), VI (1939), pp. 312-321; J. Straub, "Konstantins christliches Sendungsbewusstsein," *Das neue Bild der Antike*, hrsg. von H. Berve, II (Leipzig, 1942), pp. 374-394; A. H. M. Jones, *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe* (London, 1948); reviews of this book and of J. Vogt's *Constantin der Grosse* and of A. Alföldi's *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome* by G. Downey, *American Journal of Philology*, LXXXI (1950), pp. 99-104; reviews of Alföldi,

So much, for the moment, for the tradition that the Church of the Apostles was built by Constantine the Great. The other tradition, which ascribes the construction of the church to Constantius, may now be examined. Prominent here are Philostorgius, the church historian, Procopius of Caesarea, Constantine of Rhodes, and Nikolaos Mesarites. The testimony of Philostorgius,<sup>44</sup> considered by itself, might be suspected of bias because of his Arian leanings and his tendency to glorify Constantius. The evidence of the other three writers, however, seems unimpeachable. While they all lived some time after the building of the original Church of the Apostles, they all wrote descriptions of the church in which the building itself was the center of interest; and the circumstances in which each of them wrote suggest that their descriptions would have been regarded, at the time when they were written, as authoritative.

Procopius, in his treatise on the building activities of the Emperor Justinian, written during the latter part of the emperor's reign, described, accurately and in some detail, the new Church of the Apostles which Justinian had built to take the place of the original church, which had been (Procopius says) built by Constantius. As a description, this passage is the most full and accurate in the whole treatise, being more exact, architecturally, than the account of St. Sophia, though it is not as elaborate and fulsome as the description of the Great Church. Procopius' treatise was written for presentation to the emperor, and the first book, describing the emperor's buildings at Constantinople, was probably composed originally as a panegyric, to be delivered orally before the emperor and the court. Procopius had access to official records when he was writing the *De aedificiis*.<sup>45</sup>

*op. cit.*, by W. J. Oates, *Theology Today*, VII (1950), pp. 423–427; by R. A. S. C., *Num. Chron.*, ser. 6, vol. VIII (1948), pp. 107–109; by H. St. L. B. Moss, *Journal of Roman Studies*, XXXIX (1949), pp. 167–169; by Mary L. Carlson, *Classical Weekly*, XLIV (1950/51), p. 88; review of Vogt, *op. cit.*, by W. Ensslin, *Gnomon*, XXI (1949), pp. 328–334. Note also the study of Vogt mentioned above, n. 39.

<sup>44</sup> *Hist. eccl.*, III, 2, pp. 32–33, ed. J. Bidez (Leipzig, 1913); cf. *Artemii Passio*, 17 (*ibid.*). Philostorgius lived *ca.* 368 – *ca.* 433. His *Ecclesiastical History*, a continuation of Eusebius', covered the period to 425. Philostorgius went to Constantinople at the age of twenty (*ca.* 388), and spent some years there, possibly on several occasions (see the introduction to Bidez's edition, pp. cvi–cix). One of the preserved fragments of his work, which gives an account of the foundation of the city and of Constantine's building activities in that connection (pp. 20–22, ed. Bidez), shows that Philostorgius took an interest in the antiquities of the capital, and it seems certain that he could have made himself familiar with the history of the Church of the Apostles. According to Philostorgius (III, 2, pp. 32–33, ed. Bidez), Constantius first constructed a mausoleum for his father's body, and later built the Church of the Apostles to do honor to his father's tomb.

<sup>45</sup> Procopius describes the church in *De aed.*, I, 4, 9–23, pp. 23–26 ed. J. Haury (Leipzig, 1913). The passage in which Procopius gives the name of the founder of the church as Constantius was in the older editions incorrectly reproduced, the name of the founder being by mistake given as Constantine; see above, n. 7. On the character and date of the work, see

The work of Constantine of Rhodes had much the same character and standing. Constantine wrote the poem in which the church is described at some time between 931 and 944.<sup>46</sup> The poem was written (its author says) at the invitation of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (913–959).<sup>47</sup> The scholarly emperor had a particular interest in the church, which had been restored by his grandfather Basil I.<sup>48</sup> Constantine VII himself wrote an oration for delivery at the festival of the *translatio* of the body of St. John Chrysostom to the church (presumably on the five hundredth anniversary of the *translatio*, which fell in 938),<sup>49</sup> and another discourse (now lost) for

G. Moravcsik, *Die byz. Quellen der Gesch. der Türkvölker* (Budapest, 1942), pp. 304–306; G. Downey, “The Composition of Procopius, *De aedificiis*,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, LXXVIII (1947), pp. 171–183; E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, II (Paris, 1949), pp. 421–422, 721–723. The evidence that the first book of the *De aed.* was originally composed as a panegyric will be reviewed in an article by the present writer entitled “Notes on Procopius, *De aedificiis*, Book I,” which will be published in another place. The evidence, briefly, is as follows. The first book, continuing the account of Justinian’s buildings at Constantinople, is the largest of the six books in the treatise, and constitutes almost one quarter of the whole work. Justinian’s activities in his capital are treated with a care and an attention to literary detail which are not sustained in the remainder of the treatise. The length of Book I (approximately ten thousand words) would be well adapted to oral presentation. Procopius speaks (I, 8, 15) of “the shrine of St. John the Baptist, which the Emperor Justinian recently dedicated to him at Hebdomum.” The remark that a church had “recently” been built would have no particular significance in a treatise designed to be read by the general public, but would be appropriate in an oral discourse. Procopius, in describing a statue of Theodora (I, 11, 8–9), speaks of the Empress’ beauty as though she were still living. Procopius was at work on Book V of the treatise in 559/60, when Justinian was seventy-seven years old and Theodora had been dead for eleven or twelve years. The warmth of the terms in which he speaks of her suggests that Procopius wrote this passage with a view to the effect it would produce when Justinian and the court heard it. The arrangement of the material in Book I in topical rather than topographical fashion also suggests oral presentation; the account was plainly intended for persons who were already familiar with the buildings, rather than for readers who might not have known the city. It is possible that the *De aed.* had its genesis in a rhetorical performance commanded by Justinian and that the remainder of the treatise was projected only after the success of the presentation at court of what is now Book I. That Book I was carefully worked over and in part rewritten, possibly when the remainder of the treatise was written, is indicated by the circumstance that the differences between the two principal MSS. (A and V), which appear to represent two redactions of the treatise, are greatest in this Book.

<sup>46</sup> In vv. 22–26, p. 37, ed. E. Legrand, *Revue des études grecques*, IX (1896), the poet speaks of four coëmperors who were in power when the passage was written; the only period during Constantine’s reign when there were four *basileis* (Constantine VII, Romanus I, and Romanus’ sons Stephen and Constantine) was August 931–16 December 944. On the reading of the passage (v. 477, p. 50, ed. Legrand) in which the name of the founder of the church is given as Constantius but is wrongly reported as Constantine in Legrand’s and Begleri’s editions, see above, n. 8.

<sup>47</sup> In vv. 8, 277, 278, 301, pp. 36, 44, 45, ed. Legrand.

<sup>48</sup> Const. Porph., *Vita Basili*, 80, p. 323, 1–5, Bonn ed.

<sup>49</sup> K. I. Δυοβονιώτης, “Κωνσταντίνου Πορφυρογεννήτου λόγος ἀνέκδοτος εἰς τὴν ἀνακομιδὴν τοῦ λειψάνου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου,” *Ἐπιστημονική Ἐπετηρὶς τῆς Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς* (Athens), I (1924–1926), pp. 303–319.

delivery at the annual commemoration of the *translatio* of the body of St. Gregory of Nazianzus to the church.<sup>50</sup> He likewise constructed a shrine of St. Theophano within the *kyklion* of the church.<sup>51</sup> The inclusion of the list of the imperial tombs at the Church of the Apostles<sup>52</sup> as an annex to the *Book of Ceremonies* likewise is suggestive of the emperor's interest in the church. The writing of the description of the church by Constantine of Rhodes would occupy an important place in the literary program of Constantine VII, who set himself the task of making an immense inventory of all the intellectual achievements of Byzantium.<sup>53</sup>

Nikolaos Mesarites' description of the church, written at some time between 1198 and 1203, likewise represents work carried out under official auspices.<sup>54</sup> In 1201 Mesarites was sacristan (*skeuophylax*) of the churches in the Great Palace, and simultaneously held an appointment on the administrative staff of St. Sophia.<sup>55</sup> Apparently he wrote his *ekphrasis* of the Church of the Apostles in an effort to redeem the dignity of the church after the imperial tombs attached to it had been plundered (1197) by Alexius III in an effort to raise money for the payment of the annual tribute which had been imposed upon the Byzantine Empire by Henry VI (1196).<sup>56</sup> Very likely the impulse for the writing of the *ekphrasis* came from the Patriarch, John X Camaterus (1198–1206), to whom the work is dedicated (chap.

<sup>50</sup> See Moravcsik, *op. cit.* (above, n. 45), p. 209.

<sup>51</sup> *Patria in Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, pp. 282, 1–7, and 288, 8–10, ed. Preger.

<sup>52</sup> Const. Porph., *De Caerimoniiis*, pp. 642–646, Bonn ed.

<sup>53</sup> See Moravcsik, *op. cit.* (above, n. 45), p. 207; L. Bréhier, *Vie et mort de Byzance* (Paris, 1947), p. 181; A. Stransky, "Constantino VII Porfirogenito, amante delle arti e collezionista," *Atti del V. Congr. int. de studi biz.*, II (*Studi biz.*, VI) (1940), pp. 412–422; the introduction by R. J. H. Jenkins in Const. Porph., *De adm. imp.*, ed. Moravcsik and Jenkins (Budapest, 1949), pp. 5–13; A. Blanchet, "L'influence artistique de Constantin Porphyrogénète," *Ann. de l'Inst. de philol. et d'hist. orient. et slaves*, IX (1949), pp. 97–104 (*Mél. H. Grégoire*); M. Schapiro, "The Place of the Joshua Roll in Byzantine History," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, ser. 6, vol. XXXV (1949), p. 174.

<sup>54</sup> The date is indicated by the allusion (XLIII, p. 95, ed. Heisenberg) to the kinship between the Patriarch John X Camaterus (1198–1206) and the Empress Euphrosyne, wife of Alexius III Angelus (1195–1203). This allusion would have been apt only during the years of the patriarch's incumbency which coincided with the time when the empress was on the throne; see Heisenberg, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 7–8. The date given by Heisenberg for John's succession, 1199, has been corrected to 1198 by the researches of V. Grumel, "La chronologie des Patriarches de Constantinople de 1111 à 1206," *Études byz.*, I (1943), pp. 263–268, 270.

<sup>55</sup> See A. Heisenberg, *Nikolaos Mesarites, Die Palastrevolution des Johannes Komnenos* (Progr. Würzburg, 1907), pp. 54–55.

<sup>56</sup> Nicetas Choniates, *De Alexio Isacii Angeli fr.*, I, p. 632, 2–12, Bonn ed.; *id.*, *De signis Constantinopolitanis*, II, pp. 855–856, Bonn ed. On the episode, see G. Ostrogorsky, *Gesch. des byz. Staates* (Munich, 1940), p. 293; Bréhier, *op. cit.* (above, n. 53), pp. 361–362; A. A. Vasiliev, "Imperial Porphyry Sarcophagi in Constantinople," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, No. 4 (1948), pp. 15–16.

xlivi). Coming to the patriarchal throne a year after the violation of the tombs, John X would have had a special interest in restoring the honor of the Church of the Apostles.

The qualifications of these three writers as authorities on the Church of the Apostles are impressive. Moreover, the descriptions which they give of the church indicate that all three authors had an intimate knowledge of the building; this is especially true of Constantine of Rhodes and Mesarites, whose accounts are detailed.<sup>57</sup>

The choice with which we are confronted leaves little room for doubt. The attribution of the Church of the Apostles to Constantine the Great goes back to a *Vita Constantini* bearing the name of Eusebius which, though it doubtless contains a kernel of material by Eusebius, seems very clearly to have been altered and interpolated at some time after Eusebius' death; and the presence in the description of the church of the telltale remark that Constantine's tomb is to be seen "even now" suggests that this is one of the passages which have been tampered with. Over against this dubious testimony we have the attribution of the church to Constantius in the works of three authors who wrote under official auspices, had an intimate knowledge of the building, which they described for its own sake, and must have been familiar with the commemorative building inscription which the building undoubtedly contained. It seems beyond question that the Church of the Apostles was built by Constantius.<sup>58</sup> It is naturally possible that Constantine

<sup>57</sup> There is unfortunately no evidence for a building inscription recording the labors of Constantius and Justinian, as builders of the original church and of its successor, which Procopius, Constantine of Rhodes, and Mesarites might have seen. The meager character of the surviving epigraphic material of this kind in Constantinople is illustrated by the studies of S. G. Mercati, "Sulle iscrizioni di Santa Sofia," *Bessarione*, XXXVIII (1922), pp. 200-218, and of C. A. Mango, "The Byzantine Inscriptions of Constantinople: A Bibliographical Survey," *American Journal of Archaeology*, LV (1951), pp. 52-66. For the churches of Rome, the material is somewhat more abundant; see H. Leclercq, "Inscriptions latines chrétiennes," Cabrol-Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, VII, 1, cols. 804-805. Malalas quotes the inscription on the Great Church built by Constantius at Antioch, p. 326, 1-4, Bonn ed.

<sup>58</sup> In the past scholars have attempted to solve the conflict in the traditions by supposing that the differing statements mean that the church and the mausoleum were begun by Constantine, that they remained unfinished at his death, and that they were completed by Constantius. This was the opinion of Du Cange, *Const. Christ.* (Paris, 1680), Book IV, pp. 105-106; of Th. Reinach, in his commentary on E. Legrand's edition of Constantine of Rhodes, *Revue des études grecques*, IX (1896), p. 92; and of Heisenberg, *Grabeskirche u. Apostelkirche* (Leipzig, 1908), II, p. 110, and one will find it repeated in the handbooks. The solution is possible, *per se*, for there are other cases in which buildings begun by one emperor and finished by another are attributed by some sources to the one and by other sources to the other (see G. Downey, "Imperial Building Records in Malalas," *Byz. Ztschr.*, XXXVIII [1938], pp. 1-15, 299-311). There is, however, a major difficulty in the way of such a solution, which has not been recognized. This is that the *Vita Constantini* attributed to Eusebius states expressly that the church was completed before Constantine's death, and if we are to suppose

projected the building of such a church, but the present study has indicated that there is no reason, from the account of the *Vita*, and the accounts of the

that the *Vita* speaks of the mausoleum, the *Vita*'s account must be taken to mean that the mausoleum was likewise completed before the emperor's death. This seems, at least so far as the *Vita* is concerned, to exclude the possibility of the church's having been begun by Constantine and completed by Constantius. A further difficulty is that there is no writer, among the extant sources, who states or even hints that the church was begun by Constantine and finished by Constantius. If such had been the case, we might perhaps expect someone to mention the fact, and though it is possible that no source should happen to do so, this silence is worthy of remark, and must be borne in mind. Heisenberg (*op. cit.*, II, pp. 112-116) thought it possible to reconcile the traditions by supposing that Constantine's funeral was held in the unfinished Church of the Apostles and that his body was laid temporarily in the Church of St. Acacius pending construction of the mausoleum, which is attributed to Constantius by Philostorgius, Procopius, Zonaras, and Mesarites. However, the circumstance that no source mentions specifically that the funeral and the temporary burial were so arranged indicates, to Heisenberg, that Mesarites is mistaken in stating that Constantine was buried first in St. Acacius'. Mesarites' account, Heisenberg thought, reflects a misunderstanding of an incident which is recorded by several writers. Late in 359, when the structure in which Constantine's body lay became weakened, and threatened to collapse, Macedonius, the Bishop of Constantinople, transferred the emperor's body to the Church of St. Acacius. His action provoked opposition and there was a riot, in which people were killed or injured, when the body was removed. Constantius was so angry that he had Macedonius removed from office at a synod which met in January, 360; and the emperor's body was returned to its former resting place, which was presumably the mausoleum of Constantine. Mesarites, in Heisenberg's view, wrongly supposed that this temporary transfer of the body to St. Acacius' was actually its original burial. Constantine must thus, in Heisenberg's opinion, have been buried originally at the Holy Apostles, in a mausoleum which he built for the purpose. Constantine did not, however, build the mausoleum as a mausoleum for himself and his family but as a martyrium for the Twelve Apostles, among whom he himself would lie as the Thirteenth Apostle. Architecturally, Heisenberg believed, the mausoleum and the church were an imitation of the buildings which Constantine had already erected at the Holy Sepulcher. There, according to Heisenberg, Constantine had set up a cenotaph for Christ, at which services were to be held and prayers offered. In similar fashion, at Constantinople, he erected a church in which services were to be held and prayers offered at his own grave. This was a martyrium for the apostles, in which (according to the Eusebian *Vita Constantini*) stood twelve cenotaphs for the apostles and a sarcophagus for himself. This original plan was changed, Heisenberg believed, when Constantius brought the relics of the three apostles to Constantinople in 356 and 357 and placed them in the church proper. The twelve cenotaphs now lost their meaning, and actually the church ought now to have been called the Church of SS. Andrew, Luke, and Timothy. However, the old name continued in use. The rotunda with its twelve sarcophagi now became a mausoleum for the imperial family, and Constantius was in due time buried there himself, according to Gregory of Nazianzen and Philostorgius. This hypothesis, Heisenberg supposed, would explain the statement of Socrates, who, knowing the custom of imperial burials at the Holy Apostles which prevailed in his own day, inferred that Constantine's plan was to originate this custom. Heisenberg's re-creation of Constantine's intention is rejected by H. Vincent and F.-M. Abel, *Jérusalem*, II (Paris, 1914), p. 163, n. 4, by Baynes, *op. cit.* (above, n. 43), pp. 94-95, and by Kaniuth, *op. cit.* (above, n. 28). It seems impossible to accept Heisenberg's conclusions (1) because he does not take into account the testimony of Paulinus of Nola and "Leo Grammaticus" that the relics of the three apostles were taken to Constantinople by Constantine; while this evidence is not strong enough to stand against that of Philostorgius and his followers, it does suggest the legendary character of the account of Constantine's actions which could come into being; (2) because he does not

writers which followed it, to suppose that Constantine acted as he is said to have done, and has suggested that the *Vita*'s story represents an *ex post facto* interpretation of Constantius' construction of the church.<sup>59</sup>

In presenting this conclusion, it is necessary to point out that the scholars who in the past have studied the history of the Church of the Apostles have not had available certain important evidence. Du Cange, when he concluded that the building was begun by Constantine and completed by Constantius, did not know the works of Constantine of Rhodes and of Mesarites (first published respectively in 1896 and 1908), who both attribute the enterprise solely to Constantius. Moreover, there was no reason, in Du Cange's time, to think that parts of the *Vita Constantini* are not by Eusebius. Had the great Byzantinist been aware of these points, we may suspect that his conclusion as to the authorship of the church might have been different. Heisenberg, who wrote the most detailed study of the history of the Church of the Apostles, published his monograph in 1908, before the question of the authorship of parts of the *Vita Constantini* had become a subject of extensive debate. Moreover, Heisenberg did not know that Constantine of Rhodes actually attributes the construction of the original church to Constantius.

The traditional authority of the *Vita Constantini* attributed to Eusebius has remained, in some quarters, so great that any aspersion upon it as a historical source has something of an air of iconoclasm. It must, however, be remembered that in realizing that the *Vita* is not wholly authentic, we actually are the gainers. If some of the edifying tales offered in the *Vita* were

---

give due consideration to the tradition (represented by Procopius, Constantine of Rhodes, and Mesarites) that the church was originally built by Constantius (he did not, indeed, know that Constantine of Rhodes actually attributes the church to Constantius); (3) because Mesarites' version of Constantine's burial need not be rejected merely because it does not appear elsewhere; on the contrary, it fits admirably with the tradition that the mausoleum was built by Constantius, a tradition which Heisenberg either overlooked in this connection, or seriously underestimated.

<sup>59</sup> If we reject the Eusebian tradition, and suppose that the Church of the Apostles and the attached mausoleum were both built by Constantius, it follows that the accounts of Constantine's funeral at the Holy Apostles which are given by the Eusebian *Vita Constantini* and its followers are pious tales. Naturally, if one believes that the story that Constantine built the church is a reverential legend, which arose among early writers who were understandably eager to glorify the Church's first imperial patron, it is no more difficult to believe that the accounts of the funeral are a similar fiction. P. Franchi de' Cavalieri's careful study of the accounts of Constantine's funeral ("I funerali ed il sepolcro di Costantino Magno," *Mél. d'archéol. et d'hist. [École française de Rome]*, XXXVI [1916-1917], pp. 220-240), though it is based on the assumption that the Eusebian account is genuine, serves to show that most of the details given of the funeral are characteristic of Roman imperial funerals, and appear in many of the accounts of the funerals of other emperors. There are also minor discrepancies in the account of Constantine's funeral (noted by Franchi) which, while they need only signify that the writers were guilty of slips of the pen, could certainly indicate that there was some play of imagination in the writing of the accounts.

written by an unknown hagiographer of some other saint, they would instantly be recognized as pious embroidery. Recognition of such a fact would by no means detract from the stature of Constantine; it would only serve to clarify his position in history and to illuminate the emperor's figure as it was seen by his contemporaries and by the generations which immediately followed his own. And of course in taking away from Eusebius the credit for having written certain unconvincing parts of the *Vita*, we are both doing the historian a service and placing our own studies on a more sensible basis. An example of the value of recent research on the *Vita Constantini* may be found in the view of Jakob Burckhardt, which has now become a historical curiosity. Burckhardt, who supposed that the *Vita* was wholly the work of Eusebius, concluded from his study of it that Eusebius was "the first thoroughly dishonest historian of antiquity."<sup>60</sup> Thanks to the recent study of the *Vita*, it is no longer either possible or necessary to reach such an extreme conclusion with respect to Eusebius' work. The analysis of the *Vita*, and the identification of interpolations and alterations in it, is constructive, not destructive.

It remains for us to point out certain details of Constantius' activity in connection with the Church of the Apostles. The date of the building is suggested by the dates at which the relics of the three apostles were taken to the church; the relics of Timothy were deposited in the church on 1 July 356, those of Andrew and Luke on 3 March 357.<sup>61</sup> Considered in the light of Constantius' career, the dates of the translations of the relics have great significance for the construction of the Church of the Apostles. From 338 until 350 Constantius was principally occupied with the defence of the Persian frontier. During this period he made his headquarters at Antioch, where he must have been constantly preoccupied with the almost annual incursions of the enemy.<sup>62</sup> He became sole emperor in 350 on the death of Constans (18 January), and early in 351, taking advantage of distractions

<sup>60</sup> Burckhardt's *Die Zeit Konstantins des Grossen* was published at Leipzig in 1852 (ed. 2, 1880; reprinted 1929, 1950). The quotation is taken from the English translation by Moses Hadas under the title *The Age of Constantine the Great* (New York, 1949), p. 283. A conclusion similar to Burckhardt's was reached by A. Crivellucci, who, like Burckhardt, supposed that Eusebius was the author of the whole of the *Vita* as we have it today. Crivellucci wrote (*op. cit.* [above, note 32], p. 134), "Essa [the *Vita*] ha servito finora di fonte, e di fonte principale, a tutti quelli che hanno scritto di Costantino e delle sue relazione col cristianesimo, mentre, se le conclusioni nostre come crediamo son giuste, chi voglia scrivere la vita di Costantino non può fidarsi di Eusebio se non quando la sua testimonianza è confermata da quelle di altri scrittori autorevoli e da documenti: il che è quanto dire che deve considerare Eusebio *tanquam non esset*." This statement, like those of Burckhardt, seems exaggerated in the light of our present knowledge, but the considerations which led to it remain unchanged.

<sup>61</sup> On the *translationes* of the relics, see above, p. 57, with nn. 17-18.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. A. Piganiol, *L'Empire chrétien, 325-395* (Paris, 1947), pp. 75-78.

ὁ πρώτος γένεσις τοῦ λαοφόρου.  
 ἐν τῷ Κρατίδι τῷ μαύροις τοῖς  
 ὕσπειτοι οὐδὲν αὔρατον εἴπολον.  
 τεῖστικόν σε δεῖς ταῖς λοιπάκαροι.  
 δεινογένετος εἰτε λίαν.  
 τρούγαρος χρήπιδες χειρῶν γένεσι.  
 χύνεται σκύπεον ωραιόν.  
 γένεσιστοι τοιχούροι απλαγένοι.  
 τρούγενεπορέστησιν κατάλιγκο.  
 αρεσκατεργύσαντο οὐδὲ κέρατον.  
 οὐδὲ στοσούτοιχεπειγόν.  
 ὅταν καλιτῶν, οὐτεισόλαχεν.  
 καμηδαντοπρώτη εκείσπισμά.  
 σπινίκαπρόνιμη επίτιττον.  
 οὐτούρρεοντοπρώτη επίτιττον,  
 οὐτελαχίστοσλοκάρτετοντοπρώτη.  
 υποφρόνετεμποναεκάτοτε  
 πρότονημαλαστίρεατίττον.  
 καίσοματίνεστοσέροσρώχειολ.  
 κλιτηρπρέεχτώπρεσσοντοκάρτη.  
 οὐτώντελονγήτων δόλον παντά.  
 πρεπόδοντοκρατούμενον  
 κανιοντοκάστοντοναμάρ.  
 οὐτηπορθεντολοφώνηλίου.  
 αλλογράδιοισσυέσπελη.  
 πονταργήτοσφαιροσωλοκάρτη.  
 απεριστούλοισκεφτοσίκασον.  
 φέρεντάρεστοντοπρώτη.  
 οπεροιστούλοισκοντοπρώτη.  
 αλλοιστούλοισκοντοπρώτη.  
 λαίποτούλοισκοντοπρώτη.

καιτώνοστατοφρικτοράταλαμπα.  
 ανίδατεκυποκένφατοπότλα.  
 πονταργήτοσφατοπρώτη.  
 μοκώναπδονσιππεικλάρηπόλ.  
 φρούφερεμπύπωσινέγεονξεύν.  
 καιτόξανκαιχικατύραπότλ.  
 γούκαλετούσταρμάκεατ.  
 τρούκανετρέτατοπότλ.  
 σίκοσμακτώνχεματίροτποτ.  
 διλόνικατάρχούτοσφατ.  
 οπδυσίμαρούτοσίκλαρηδόν.  
 αλλομεκράνπωστώκατάδοφέρ.  
 λαμένοδεχλωτούδεπριμέτρο.  
 καιφώστοχο, πασονίγρασσκτίσ.  
 οκτωνπατρούνιγραμνασητέο.  
 καιτημέταντοσίκλαρηδόν.  
 τονδεμελατοχρόνιμάρτρεφε.  
 κτίστοτονδετόνπεικλαρέμον.  
 τούτεντρέον. λοικάτε. κτημάτον,  
 τώνκαλλινίκωνκαίσοφόπότλ.  
 οπρημακεούτονχεόνουνσιτόν  
 ιονταγκαλάτηροτόγρισπότλ.  
 καιοχίκατοπόντημαχίψεν.  
 μιδέμεροτοπέέροντηρηστόσον.  
 περιγένενητόνδελάτεσονφέρ.  
 παδσαμπτίκαρθοττώροκάνπόλ.  
 φέπεπόλφασκοσέλληνλόγο.  
 αρκτοντεκαίλεοντοντελωμόν.  
 αλλούσκλαρητώναπότλροίνος,  
 τωνφωτούσφροκόνισηρημάρ.  
 ουραρητοπέρισσούρησονκάδ

13. Constantine of Rhodes, *Description of the Church of the Holy Apostles and Account of the Statues and Columns of the City*, lines 455–514 (Athos, Laura of St. Athanasius, cod. Δ 170, f. 143v). Line 477 is the thirteenth from the top in the left-hand column.

among the Persians, he went to the West to deal with the usurpation of Magnentius. The defeat of Magnentius in the late summer of 353 left Constantius relatively free, for the first time in his career, from the urgent cares which had hitherto beset him. It is important to note that the series of the emperor's decrees against paganism begins in 353.<sup>63</sup> Magnentius, in order to attract followers, had permitted pagan observances, so that one of Constantius' first tasks, after the defeat of the usurper, was to suppress the practices which had thus been encouraged.<sup>64</sup> The emperor's own bent would of course have added impetus to this campaign, and his measures against the pagans were severe indeed. The strongest of his decrees, which prescribes capital punishment for persons who perform pagan sacrifices or worship images, is dated 19 February 356.<sup>65</sup> The timing and content of these decrees indicates that Constantius now felt at liberty to turn to matters of religious policy. In this year also there falls the new settlement of the Athanasian controversy, as a result of which Athanasius was driven from Alexandria into his third exile, so that by the end of 356 the unity of the church seemed realized.<sup>66</sup>

This chronology suggests that the bringing of the relics of the three apostles to Constantinople in 356 and 357 shows that the construction of the Church of the Apostles was begun at this time. The construction of such a great church would be an appropriate part of a systematic campaign to strengthen the Christian faith and stamp out paganism; and the translation of Timothy's relics seems to have been connected with the beginning of the work of construction. The ceremony of *καθιέρωσις*, the consecration of the altar, was the first solemnity which had to be performed when the construction of a new church was begun; and this rite included the deposition of relics beneath the altar.<sup>67</sup>

<sup>63</sup> *Cod. Theod.*, XVI, 10, 5, of 23 Nov. 353.

<sup>64</sup> J. Geffcken, *Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums*, ed. 2 (Heidelberg, 1929), pp. 98–99.

<sup>65</sup> *Cod. Theod.*, XVI, 10, 6. A decree ordering the closing of temples (XVI, 10, 4), dated in the text in 346, is almost certainly to be dated instead on 1 Dec. 356; cf. Piganiol, *op. cit.*, p. 96, n. 44.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. B. J. Kidd, *A Hist. of the Church to A.D. 461* (Oxford, 1922), II, pp. 117 ff., 130–132; Piganiol, *op. cit.*, pp. 95–96.

<sup>67</sup> See P. de Meester, *Liturgia Bizantina, Studi di rito Bizantino*, Libro II, Parte VI, *Rituale-Benedizionale Bizantino* (Rome, 1930), pp. 174, 179, 184, 187–8. Symeon of Thessalonica, in his account of the ceremony of *καθιέρωσις* (the consecration of the altar of a new church), says that relics were placed under the altar because “the martyrs are the foundations (*θεμέλιοι*) of the church” (*De sacro templo*, 116, in P.G., CLV, 320 C). This doctrine goes back to Ephesians ii, 19–22: “Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the

A further point of chronology likewise suggests that the building of the church was begun in 356. Late in 359 Macedonius, the Bishop of Constantinople, removed the body of Constantine from the building in which it lay (presumably the mausoleum constructed by Constantius), on the pretext that the structure was weakened and threatened to collapse<sup>68</sup> (possibly as a result of damage suffered in the earthquake which destroyed Nicomedia on 24 August 358).<sup>69</sup> Macedonius took the emperor's body to the Church of St. Acacius in which, according to Mesarites (I, p. 10), Constantine had originally been buried. This church evidently would have been chosen for refuge because Constantine had built it and had first been buried there, and because it was near the mausoleum. Macedonius' action would thus have been simply to return the body to its original place of burial. It seems, however, at least equally possible that St. Acacius' was chosen because the Holy Apostles was not yet completed. If the Holy Apostles had been available as a place of safety for the body when the mausoleum threatened to collapse, one would think that it would have been considered more in keep-

building fitly framed together growtheth unto an holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." A curiously graphic illustration of the custom of burying relics within an altar appears in a miniature of a Psalter (cod. Uglitsk, 1485) in the Public Library in Leningrad. Here there is shown, in perspective view, a square altar surmounted by a ciborium supported by four columns; and, as though lying inside the altar, three bodies: F. Buslaev, *Drevne-Russkaia Narodnaia Literatura* (St. Petersburg, 1861), p. 212. This miniature is an illustration of Psalm xxxiv, 19-20 (LXX xxxiii, 20-21), "Many are the afflictions of the righteous; but the Lord delivereth him out of them all. He keepeth all his bones; not one of them is broken." The day of the *translatio* of the relics of St. Timothy, 1 July, immediately follows the festival of all the Apostles, 30 June. There is, at least so far as I have been able to discover, no evidence to show when the festival of all the Apostles was first celebrated, and it cannot be assumed that it had been introduced as early as 356. If, however, the festival had been established as early as 356, the conjunction of the dates 30 June and 1 July would suggest that the *translatio* of the relics of Timothy (which were the first relics to be brought to the church) was arranged as a part of the ceremony of the inauguration of the construction of the building. Since the church was to be dedicated to all the Apostles, the most fitting time for the beginning of the work would be the day of their festival. The deposition of the relics of an apostle under the altar would naturally take place in connection with this festival, but would be held on a separate day in order to allow for the proper observance both of the festival of all the Apostles and of the procession and ceremony of the *translatio*.

<sup>68</sup> The episode is described by Socrates, *Hist. eccl.*, II, 38 = P.G. LXVII, 329-332; Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.*, IV, 21 = P.G. LXVII, 1176-1177; Theophanes, A.M. 5852, p. 46, 1-8 ed. De Boor; Zonaras, XIII, 11, 25-27, v. III, p. 58, 3-11 Bonn ed. Accounts based on these sources appear in Cedrenus I, p. 530, 6-13 Bonn ed.; Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos, *Hist. eccl.*, IX, 42 = P.G. CXLVI, 392-393; in the *Chronicle* of Ephraemius, vv. 9632-9639, p. 386 Bonn ed.; and in the *Synopsis Chronike*, p. 55, 17-21, in K. N. Sathas, *Bibl. graeca medii aevi*, VII.

<sup>69</sup> On the earthquake, see Amm. Marc., XVII, 7, 1-8, and W. Ruge, "Nikomediea," *R.E.*, XVII, 478. Ammianus states that the shocks were felt throughout Asia, Macedonia, and Pontus.

ing with the emperor's dignity to transfer his body to this great new church than to St. Acacius'.<sup>70</sup> The original Church of the Apostles had a wooden

<sup>70</sup> Macedonius' action in transferring Constantine's body, as an episode in his struggle with Constantius, may have had a number of motives, and the opposition to it may have arisen from various sources. His procedure, the texts tell us, was vigorously supported by his own adherents, and as vigorously opposed by those who thought it impious to move the body; and the adherents of the Homoousian doctrine also opposed the plan. A riot ensued, with much bloodshed, at the Church of St. Acacius. Constantius, who is said to have been absent from Constantinople at the time, was furious with Macedonius, and had him deposed at the synod which met at Constantinople in January, 360. While the incident might, as some scholars have supposed (e.g., G. Bardy in his article on Macedonius and the Macedonians, *Dict. de théol. cath.*, IX, 1471), represent merely an effort on the part of Macedonius to display his power, it seems likely that the episode has a deeper significance. The transfer of a body was impious; removal of the body of the First Christian Emperor would have been even more offensive to many people. Macedonius (unless he was very shortsighted indeed) must have had some good reason to think that he would receive at least some popular support for such a daring action. If his plan had been merely to rescue the body from a weakened building, it might have had some approval as an emergency measure; but if it were a restoration of a previously existing arrangement, then Macedonius' apparently daring project can be understood much better. Since Constantine had originally lain at St. Acacius', Constantius' removal of his body to the new mausoleum might well have been disapproved, even opposed, by those who supported the old order. In this case, Macedonius' action was not simply a malign effort to pick a quarrel with Constantius, but would seem to many to be a justified effort to rectify an odious action of Constantius', which would undo an arrangement which may have seemed undesirable to many people (on the relationships between Constantius and Macedonius, see B. J. Kidd, *A History of the Church to A.D. 461* [Oxford, 1922], II, pp. 178-179, and E. Gerland, "Die Vorgeschichte des Patriarchates von Konstantinopel," *Byz.-neugriech. Jahrbücher*, IX [1930-1932], pp. 217-230). Support for this interpretation of the episode may be found in the circumstance that there may be reason to think that the damage to the building in which Constantine's body lay may not have been as serious as Macedonius pretended it was. While the supposed damage to the building may have been caused by the earthquake which destroyed Nicomedia in 358, and while the notices in the *Chronica Constantinopolitana*, in the *Chronicle* of Jerome, and in the *Chronicon Paschale* of the church's dedication in 370 may indicate that it had had to be repaired, it is significant that the condition of the structure did not prevent the burial of Constantius himself there in 361 (Greg. Naz., *Or. V, Contra Julianum* II, in P.G., XXV, 685 C-688 A; Amm. Marc., XXI, 16, 20; Philostorg., II, 6; Procop., *De aed.*, I, 4, 19; Mesarites, XXXIX, p. 81, ed. Heisenberg), and this suggests of course that Macedonius' pretext was an exaggeration, which was accepted as such by both parties. Whatever Constantius' real reasons may have been for any action which he took with regard to the Church of the Apostles and the mausoleum, his conduct would have been sure to provoke the opposition of his theological and political enemies, if any cause for criticism could be found in it. If Constantius changed the character of Constantine's building by introducing the relics of the three apostles into it, and by converting it into an imperial burial place, he would have been criticized by both the supporters and the critics of the dead emperor. His action could have been open to two different criticisms. Some could argue that by introducing the relics he was exaggerating in unseemly fashion the sanctity of Constantine's resting place, by tending to exalt the emperor as *is apostolos*. And on the other hand if Constantius built the church and the mausoleum, and brought his father's body there, he would have been criticized for altering his father's dispositions. The manner in which the Arianizing Constantius departed from the religious policies of Constantine makes it seem at least possible that the arrangements which he made with regard to the Holy Apostles and the burial place of Constantine may have represented a major change in Constantine's wishes and policy — or, what comes to the same thing, that this interpretation could have been put upon Constantius' actions by his opponents (on

roof,<sup>71</sup> and if it had been completed by the time of the earthquake of 24 August 358 it would have been less likely to suffer damage than the mausoleum, which was almost certainly of solid masonry construction in the Roman tradition of such buildings. However, if the Church of the Apostles had been begun in 356, it is quite possible that it was not yet completed by the end of 359.<sup>72</sup> This hypothesis would fit well with the records which place the inauguration of the Church of the Holy Apostles on 9 April 370.<sup>73</sup> If the Church remained unfinished when Constantius died (3 November 361), it seems practically certain that no work would have been done on it during Julian's reign (361–363), and it would also seem quite possible that Julian's successors, who had more pressing problems, could not have given their attention to the building immediately.<sup>74</sup>

Constantius' position with regard to ecclesiastical policy, see, for example, H. M. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, ed. 2 [Cambridge, Eng., 1900], p. 115; Kidd, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 70–71, 154 ff., 176; C. N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture* [Oxford, 1940], pp. 256–260, 273; A. Fliche and V. Martin, *Hist. de l'église*, III [Paris, 1947], pp. 157–158). If such were the case, the difference of opinion which must have existed at the time could well be responsible at least in part for the opposing traditions which we now possess with regard to the part which Constantius played in the construction of the church.

<sup>71</sup> *Patria*, in *Scr. orig. Const.*, pp. 140, 12; 214, 6; 286, 18, ed. Preger. See E. Baldwin Smith, *The Dome* (Princeton, 1950), pp. 33–34.

<sup>72</sup> Justinian's Church of St. Sophia, for example, took nearly six years to build, having been begun on 23 Feb. 532 and dedicated on 27 Dec. 537: E. H. Swift, *Hagia Sophia* (New York, 1940), p. 12. The Great Church at Antioch took six years to build, having been begun in 335 and dedicated in 341: Theophanes, A.M. 5833, p. 36, 29–31, ed. De Boor; Malalas, pp. 318, 3–6; 325–326, Bonn ed.

<sup>73</sup> See above, p. 57.

<sup>74</sup> The agreement between the evidence which suggests that the work of building the church was begun in 356, and the events of Constantius' career, which would make the foundation of such a church in this year peculiarly appropriate, seems sufficient to cast discredit upon the account which goes under the name of Theodore Lector (see above, n. 5), which suggests that Constantius completed and dedicated the church upon the occasion when he brought the relics to it. The passage attributed to Theodore states that when Constantius brought the relics of the three apostles to Constantinople, they "were buried in the great Church of the Holy Apostles which was inaugurated by him [Constantius]." The statement that Constantius inaugurated the church may simply be an inference from the fact that he brought the relics there. It is also possible that Theodore or his source confused *καθιέρωσις*, performed when relics were brought to a church, with *ἐγκαίνια* or inauguration (on the ceremonies, see de Meester, *locc. citt.* [above, n. 67], and Symeon of Thessalonica, *De sacro templo*, 115–117, 124, in P.G., CLV, 320–321, 328). Taken at face value, Theodore's statement would appear to mean that the translation of the relics and the opening of the church were related events; but his testimony, which stands alone, is not sufficient to outweigh the evidence which indicates that the church was only begun when the relics were brought there. Heisenberg himself (*op. cit.*, II, p. 112), thinking that Constantius completed the church after it had been begun by Constantine, admitted that it was difficult to understand this evidence that the church was not inaugurated until twenty years after Constantine's death. Heisenberg was not aware that this passage, printed under Theodore's name in the *Patrologia*, gives a

The sequence of events described by Philostorgius,<sup>75</sup> who states that Constantius first built his father's mausoleum, then the church, is reflected in a passage in Julian's panegyric of Constantius,<sup>76</sup> which was delivered in November of 355. Here Julian speaks of Constantius' adornment of Constantine's tomb (*τάφον*) "with many fair offerings." These words suggest that at the time when Julian spoke, Constantius had already built the mausoleum but had not yet built the church.

There remains of course the possibility that Constantine had projected the construction of a Church of the Apostles, but had been unable to start the work, and that Constantius, while he could build the mausoleum soon after Constantine's death, did not feel free to undertake the church until 356. The work may well have been delayed for financial reasons. The steady expenses of the Persian campaigns and of the operations against Magnentius must have been heavy, and while the mausoleum would have been a relatively inexpensive building, the church must, in comparison, have been costly.

With the evidence that the Church of the Apostles was built by Constantius it is interesting to compare the testimony of Themistius that it was Constantius, rather than his father, who was primarily responsible for the physical development and adornment of Constantinople. In his third and fourth orations, addressed to Constantius in 357 (IV probably on 1 January, III probably in the spring), Themistius repeatedly emphasizes that while it was the father who founded the city, it was the son who, in part carrying out his father's wishes, was actually responsible for its present magnificence. Even though this testimony appears in speeches made in honor of Constantius, it must be given some weight, since even a panegyrist like Themistius would not have dared make such statements unless there had been at least some foundation for them. At the opening of *Or. III*, the orator tells the emperor that while Constantinople is named for his father, it is in fact his own rather than his father's (40c). The oration is made as an offering of "thanks for the City's beauty and great size" (41a). While Constantine founded the Fair City (*Kallipolis*, as Themistius often calls Constantinople), it was Constantius who "added to the City what it lacked, or rather what his

different account from the passage (published by Bidez in 1908) which is certainly the work of Theodore Lector (see n. 5 above). There is an epigram in the *Palatine Anthology* (IX, 365) which is accompanied in one MS. by a note which might be taken to suggest that Julian the Apostate had visited the church while a boy. This note, however, does not appear in the *Palatinus*, the principal MS., and its authority seems highly questionable.

<sup>75</sup> See above, pp. 54, 56, 66 n. 44.

<sup>76</sup> *Or. I*, 16 C-D, ed. J. Bidez, *L'Emp. Julien, œuvres complètes*, I, 1 (Paris, 1932), pp. 25-29.

father had wished for it" (44b).<sup>77</sup> "Your City [Themistius says to Constantius, 47c-d], differs more from your father's than his differed from the ancient one, and it has changed to true and durable beauty from false and evanescent beauty. Formerly, it would seem, it was a source of enjoyment for a vehement lover, designed to fill the eye of a passionately excited man, so that it shone forth and grew old at the same time; but the adornment which you bestowed upon it was designed both for beauty and for durability . . ." <sup>78</sup>

There is of course nothing in these orations to show specifically that Constantius built the Church of the Apostles; Themistius, a pagan, would not have mentioned the church. However, these addresses make it plain that Themistius expected his hearers to believe that Constantius displayed notable activity in the construction of public buildings at Constantinople. It is also significant that the orations were delivered, most probably, early in 357, shortly after the time when (as the other evidence indicates) the construction of the Holy Apostles would have been begun. This was also, it seems, the period when Constantius would first have been free to give his attention to such undertakings. Thus it seems natural to find Constantius' building activities so prominently mentioned in the speeches written at this

<sup>77</sup> "When nearly everybody supposed [Themistius writes, 47a-c] that the happiness of the City would come to an end with your father, you did not suffer this or permit it, nor did you make the City feel any sense of the change, but rather, if one must speak the truth, you created a great sense of betterment. For you did not merely guard unharmed your father's sacred trust, but you made it manifold and increased it, nor did you merely assent to possess the things which came from him, but you added many things of your own, and you struggled emulously, in this fair contest, with the founder, as to which of you should outrun the other in benefactions. Thus Emperor struggles against Emperor, and son against father. . . In our contest and rivalry it is the whole City which is the object of contention, and now it is difficult to discover to whom it really belongs, whether to the man who sowed the seeds, or to him who tended them and brought them to perfection."

<sup>78</sup> The same atmosphere pervades the fourth oration. Here Themistius says that "like a man who loves a brother very dearly, he [Constantius] is bound by love for this temple [as Themistius often calls Constantinople] as though it were a kinsman, and he is ever contriving something so that it may be more rich and more famous" (53a-b). Later Themistius mentions that Constantine simultaneously clothed the City with its wall and elevated Constantius to the rank of Caesar (8 Nov. 324). "Thus it is right that while tripling his realm he [Constantius] increases the City which is of the same age as his imperial power, not extending the circuit wall, but contriving to add something to the City's beauty, both seeking more abundant springs of water, and building baths which bear his name, whose size you now can see, while it is expected that their beauty will match their size, and encircling the City with a covered colonnade like a luxurious girdle, and creating the royal market place like a headdress woven of gold and ornamental strips" (58b-c). Finally, Themistius describes Constantius' foundation of the public library at Constantinople (59b ff.) as a further example of his benefactions to the city.

period, while there is nothing on this subject in the earlier orations (I, II) which Themistius had addressed to the Emperor in 347 and 355.<sup>79</sup>

Themistius' testimony is paralleled by that of Julian and Zosimus. In his panegyric of Constantius, Julian states that Constantius completed Constantine's wall at Constantinople, which had only been begun by the founder, and then indicates that Constantius had to rebuild and strengthen some of Constantine's buildings.<sup>80</sup> Zosimus (II, 32) writes that some of Constantine's buildings collapsed not long after they were built because, having been put up in haste, they were not soundly constructed.

From all this it seems clear, even when allowance is made for the exaggeration of panegyric, that Constantius had a substantial share in the construction of Constantinople.<sup>81</sup> This is, in fact, what one would naturally expect. The building of the new capital was a project which could hardly have been completed within a few years, no matter how rapidly the work was pushed. It is easy to believe that, as Themistius says,<sup>82</sup> there was a tendency on the part of the great families to resist the move to Constantinople, and to regard the new city as an impermanent project. The first task of Constantine and his builders would naturally have been to construct the new circuit wall and to provide for the essential public services, especially the water supply, the markets and docks, and some of the necessary government buildings. The construction of churches may well have had to take second place, temporarily, after these projects. It is remarkable that the accounts of Constantine's foundation of the city lists no more than about ten churches built by him: St. Irene, the Holy Apostles, St. Mocius, St. Agathonicus, St. Acacius, and churches of the Archangel Michael at Anaplus and Sosthenium; the churches of St. Sophia, the Holy Dynamis, and St. Menas sometimes

<sup>79</sup> There is likewise nothing on building activities in Libanius' oration (LIX) to Constantius and Constans written in 348 or 349.

<sup>80</sup> *Or. I*, 41 A (transl. of W. C. Wright in the Loeb Classical Library): "As to your benefactions to the city of your ancestors [Constantinople], you built round it a wall that was then only begun, and all buildings that seemed to be unsound you restored and made safe for all time."

<sup>81</sup> Constantius has not always received credit for his work. For example, J. P. Richter's widely used collection of texts on the building of the Church of the Apostles (*Quellen der byz. Kunstgesch.* [Vienna, 1897], pp. 101-107) omits the passages of Philostorgius which attribute the construction of the Church to Constantius, just as his collection of texts on the original St. Sophia (pp. 12-16) omits the passage in Socrates (II, 16) which attributes the original St. Sophia to Constantius; Richter likewise omits a cross reference to the passage in Zonaras which makes the same statement, which is printed (p. 17) among the *testimonia* for Justinian's church.

<sup>82</sup> *Or. III*, 47a, 48a.

appear in these lists and sometimes are absent from them.<sup>83</sup> This seems a very small number of churches for so important a city as Constantinople, and the modesty of the list suggests that Constantine's activities in this sphere were limited. All these considerations seem to corroborate the evidence that it was Constantius who built the Church of the Apostles.<sup>84</sup>

<sup>83</sup> There came into circulation various lists of the churches built by Constantine in Constantinople, which appear, sometimes with significant variations, in various sources. For examples of such lists, see "Leo Grammaticus," p. 89, 3-7, Bonn ed. (also printed in *Theodosii Melitene qui fertur Chronographia*, ed. T. L. F. Tafel [Munich, 1859], p. 64); *Chronicon Bruxellense*, ed. F. Cumont in *Anecdota Bruxellensia*, I: *Chroniques byz. du MS. 11376* (Gand, 1894), p. 18, 24 ff.; the anon. *Vita Constantini* in cod. Angelicus 22, ed. H. G. Opitz, *Byz.*, IX (1934), p. 575, 15 ff.; Theophanes, A.M. 5816, p. 23, 30 ff., ed. De Boor; the anon. *Vita Constantini et Helenae*, ed. M. Guidi, "Un Bios di Costantino," *Rendiconti della R. Accad. dei Lincei, cl. di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, ser. 5, XVI (1897), p. 338, 12-18; the *Synopsis chronike*, p. 48, 4-9, ed. K. N. Sathas, *Bibl. graeca medii aevi*, VII. An account of an emperor's building activities was a regular feature of imperial biography; cf. G. Downey, "Imperial Building Records in Malalas," *Byz. Ztschr.*, XXXVIII (1938), p. 10, n. 3, and P. J. Alexander, "Secular Biography at Byzantium," *Speculum*, XV (1940), p. 197, n. 5.

<sup>84</sup> For valuable counsel and criticism in the preparation of this study I am indebted to Professors A. M. Friend, Jr., Francis Dvornik, and Paul A. Underwood.